

Dabbs, Paul

From: Arnold Whitridge [awhitridge@snowcrest.net]
Sent: Thursday, December 12, 2002 6:19 AM
To: dceppos@saclink.csus.edu; Dabbs, Paul
Subject: Portfolio comment

In my explorations of the portfolio for the North Coast, I noticed that Regional Transfers Out are not reflected in the Balances. I think they should be; transfers out are in fact "uses" of the "developed water supply", and critical to a comprehensive understanding of the situation in the region. In the case of the North Coast, transfers out involve more water than agriculture and urban combined; isn't this interesting for readers to know? Is a "balance" that neglects this as informative as it should be?

Smaller notes:

- As I understand it, the circled numbers on the flow diagram boxes are intended to refer to lines on the table. This doesn't work yet, at least on the North Coast diagrams. In my opinion it would be better to have no reference numbers at all than to have incorrect ones. If in fact the circled numbers have some other purpose, I hope help for me is on the way.
- As I understand it, the Regional Transfers Out box on the diagram is intended to reflect line 56 on the table, even though the current diagram reference is to line 5. Out of curiosity I tried to look up the definition for line 56, but the definitions only go up to 54.
- The Trinity River has dams and minimum flow requirements, and is wild and scenic below the dams. So it occurred to me that Trinity flows could be reported on line 44 (Instream Use), or on line 46 (Wild and Scenic Rivers Use), or both. I presume this doesn't lead to any double counting, but out of curiosity I tried to understand from the definitions and the process maps just how the numbers are generated. I couldn't tell, though I saw an opportunity for unspecified "adjustment" in the process map. Perhaps a note in the narrative would be useful for similarly curious analysts of the final product.

Arnold Whitridge